DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 395 SO 012 910

AUTHOR Beyer, Landon E.
TITLE Ideology and Aesthetic Education.
PUB DATE 11 Apr 80
NOTE 53p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 11, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Aesthetic Education: *Capitalism: *Democratic Values: *Educational Needs: *Educational Practices: Elementary Secondary Education: School Role: *Social Action

ABSTRACT

The paper documents current theories that schools serve as agents of economic and/or cultural reproduction by examining the content and form of a unit in an aesthetic education program. The central argument of reproduction theorists is that schools serve as a means of social control by perpetuating those social and cultural patterns which ensure the continued operation of a corporate capitalist economy. The document is organized into two parts. Part I describes the development of the Central Midwestern Regional Education Laboratory (CEMREL) Aesthetic Education Program, describes in detail a unit "Relating Sound and Music," and discusses ways in which the program sustains the current social order. The author focuses on the viewpoint of CEMREL toward the aesthetic experience, which is that it is concerned with phenomenal properties of objects and is amoral, apolitical, and non-ideological. Although the content of the lesson on movement and sound conforms to the philosophy of aesthetic education, the author stresses that the basis and form of the program do not. He points out that the lessons accentuate goals and de-emphasize the quality of processes: activities segment, fragment, and isolate experiences, reinforcing the disjointedness of contemporary social life: experience is depersonalized, with students and teachers taking a passive role: and activities emphasize individual participation over collective action. In Part II the author suggests placing social action and ethical conduct near the center of aesthetic education and urges a rededication of efforts in aesthetic education to the pursuit of enlightened social action rather than "enlightened cherishing." (Author/KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED194395

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Landon E. Beyer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SYMPOSIUM

Curriculum and Cultural Reproduction: Studies in the Ideology of School Practice

IDEOLOGY AND AESTHETIC EDUCATION

Landon E. Beyer
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Department of Curriculum & Instruction
574 Teacher Education Building
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

SP 012 910

Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, Massachusetts

April 11, 1980

I CULTURAL REPRODUCTION AND IDEOLOGICAL DETERMINISM

In his classic work dealing with the sociological elements of teaching, Willard Waller makes the following observation regarding the relationship between schooling and social selection:

> Partly it is the schools themselves which select. The native intelligence of children sets certain absolute limits to their achievements. No amount of schooling can make the moron perform satisfactorily above his fated level. The schools, by their curriculum which must be mastered before the student can pass on, sift and resift their human materials, selecting on the basis of intelligence chiefly, but allowing considerable weight to other qualities such as a pleasing manner, emotional stability, and diligence.[1]

Here the schools are seen as benignly differentiating between those who possess the requisite degree of ability, and those who do not. Schools, in the process of disseminating forms of knowledge, act as an academic testing ground, weeding out those who, often literally, cannot pass the test. Moreover, the educational system confers an elevated status on those who are able to master the embodiment of this knowledge, as represented by the school's curriculum.

In a somewhat similar vein, Robert Dreeben has maintained that, partly through the workings of a hidden curriculum, schools serve as a transitional element between the family and the wider society. In emphasizing the dispositional factors which importantly inform the quality of school life, Dreeben introduces his volume by telling the reader that, "The substance of the argument, then, goes as follows: If schooling forms the linkage between the family life of children and the public life of adults, it must provide experiences conducive to learning the principles of conduct and patterns of behavior appropriate to adulthood."[2] The system of public schooling clearly serves a necessary function for Dreeben, in sorting people into particular occupational and social roles. The existence of a tracking system, often overtly employed at the secondary school level, is viewed by Dreeben as essential, responding to the commitment to equality of educational opportunity.

Such a tracking system, on this view, reflects the "natural" differences between individuals and seeks to correlate differences in ability with the varying demands of the labor market.

The dual ideas that the system of public schooling exists in order to identify and maximize human potential or native ability, on the one hand, or to introduce and assimilate succeeding generations of students into the norms, values, and beliefs of the society, on the other, have often been advanced as the cornerstones upon which the educational establishment rests. Indeed such notions as these have frequently been combined with other liberal education proposals and reforms in the pursuit of an alleged meritocratic system within which goods and power can be equitably distributed. Such ideas have a long tradition in educational history as the basis for a system of publicly funded schools to be attended by the general populace.[3]

The traditions of achievement and socialization exemplified in the above views of Waller and Dreeben have played an important role within curriculum discourse and development. Within the achievement tradition, the focus tends to be placed on "determining the variables that have a major impact on an individual's or group's success or failure in school... The social goal is maximizing academic productivity."[4] Numerous research studies in curriculum and teacher education purport to show the advantages of various teaching strategies or methodologies in terms of raising student achievement, usually measured in terms of standardized test scores. In a recent issue of the American Educational Research Journal, to cite but one illustrative example, the authors of a study concerning mathematics instruction preface their discussion by reporting that, "Teachers can be instructed to improve student achievement. Previous studies have shown that when teachers are taught what constitutes good teaching behavior... and when they practice what they are taught, students achieve more... The present study extends the inquiry to

consider the instructional effects against the background of student aptitude and teacher style categories."[5] Increasing academic productivity is here explicitly advanced as an important educational aim.

The socialization tradition, likewise, permeates a good deal of curriculum development and analysis. In looking at the norms and values "taught" in school, proponents of this view characteristically restrict their perspective "to the study of what might be called 'moral knowledge.' It establishes as given the set of societal values and inquires into how the school as an agent of society socializes students into its 'shared' set of normative rules and dispositions."[6] Dreeben's functionalist view of the dispositional elements of schooling provides perhaps the most well known example here. In responding to the question of which norms students are taught to accept and act upon, the author alleges that four specific norms (independence, achievement, universalism, and specificity) are selected because, "they are integral parts of public and occupational life in industrial societies, or institutional realms adjacent to the school."[7] In terms of concrete curriculum programs and materials, many curriculum workers and public school personnel would probably agree with the supposition that, "A major task in education is the development of a value system for the student, a value system congruent with the society in which he lives."[8] On a more commonsense level, the justification for school activities in a variety of subject areas, as well as for the enforcement of a multitude of behavioral norms and regulations, by public school teachers, lies in their utility for subsequent social interactions in which students will, presumably, one day be involved.

The achievement and socialization perspectives vis a vis education discussed above share an important orientation. Proponents of the latter position tend to take an uncritical, non-problematic view of the inculcation of particular dispositions and attitudes, just as those within the achievement

oriented perspective tend to regard school knowledge as a fixed or settled category rather than involving propositions requiring argument and substantiation. Assuming that "knowledge" is objective or universal and unrelated to differences in ethnicity, sex, social class, and economic status, those who advocate the maximization of academic productivity view their activities as equitably and fairly ajudicating between individuals and groups on the basis of "native intelligence," as we saw in Waller's remarks quoted earlier. In this way schools are seen as "sifting and resifting" in the process of discovering those students who have the largest fund of native ability and are thus able to deal with and share in this knowledge. Similarly, those who argue for the importance of socialization as a function of schooling assume a "taken for granted" stance regarding the norms and values required by "the society."[9] To a large extent there is little if any serious questioning of the appropriateness or correctness of these norms; they are taken as necessary or natural end points to which efficient and correlative means may be constructed. Neither tradition self-consciously addresses questions which deal with the selection process itself, with how to justify the validation of specific knowledge forms and dispositions as legitimate. Questions such as why certain forms of knowledge and dispositional norms find their way into classrooms, whose interests are served in the process, whether the result for the wider society is just or ethically defensible, and so on, are seldom entertained or seen as relevant by the advocates of these traditions.

Increasingly within the last fifteen to twenty years, however, such an uncritical perspective has been challenged by those who seek to focus on how educational institutions form an important grid in the social matrix. Such analyses have helped spawn a new field, designated "the sociology of school knowledge," which explores how schools serve to perpetuate the existing set of institutional arrangements; schools are seen in this process as providing

authenticity to a society in which wealth and power are unequally distributed and maintained. Various Marxist and neo-Marxist authors in this tradition have been influential in arguing that the function of schooling is closely tied to the demands of an advanced, industrial, corporate society. The intent of much of this research and analysis has been to enable educators to see that what schools do is intimately tied to the demands of a corporate capitalist economy, with its attendant social and cultural formations. In exposing the ties between schooling and economic and social form, these sociologists of school knowledge raise just those questions thought extraneous and non-problematic within the traditions of achievement and socialization discussed above.

The outline of this perspective can be seen in works such as Schooling in Capitalist America, by Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis,[10] Knowledge and Control, edited by Michael F. D. Young,[11] Class, Codes and Control, Volume 3: Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions, by Basil Bernstein,[12] and Ideology and Curriculum, by Michael W. Apple,[13] among others. In arguing for a linkage between schooling and the social order, such theorists have alleged that schools serve as agents of economic and/or cultural reproduction- that they, in effect, serve as a means of social control in perpetuating those social and cultural patterns which ensure the continued operation of a corporate capitalist economy.

I shall assume in this essay that at least the outline of the arguments advanced by this group of writers is familiar enough to make a detailed examination of them unnecessary. My own view of these efforts at exposing the economic, social, and cultural determinants which impinge upon and help determine the quality of school life is rather mixed. While I strongly support attempts at uncovering or "demystifying" what goes on in schools by situating public schooling within the workings of a particular ideological

framework which gives legitimacy to our social and cultural practices, two conceptual gaps within this recent neo-Marxist tradition are, at this juncture, especially troublesome.

First, most if not all of the critiques regarding how schools serve a socially reproductive function are conceptualized and understood at a fairly abstract, macro-theoretical level. For example, Pierre Bourdieu, in his study of cultural reproduction in France, argues for the existence of "cultural capital" within schools that may be understood in much the same way that economic capital is. Schools embody the cultural symbols and patterns approved of by those groups which dominate in the larger society. Those within the educational system who feel a stake in such cultural practices, or who find them meaningful in virtue of previous experiences with them, will be a member of that ethnic group, social class, and so on, that approves of those cultural forms; they will feel a "natural" affinity for that set of cultural practices. And since this cultural capital within schools can subsequently be translated into economic capital, the cultural practices of schools are dynamically related to the continued dominance of specific classes in society. Thus, "to penalize the underprivileged and favor the most privileged, the school has only to reject, in its teaching techniques and its criteria when making academic judgments, to take into account the cultural inequalities between children of different social classes."[14] These and similar theoretical analyses of the reproductive role of educational institutions, while insightful, provide little help in understanding how the day to day activities and curriculum offerings of schools contribute to this process. Indeed the effect of such abstractions may be a further mystification of the ideological components of much of school life, offering a "top-down" view of the dynamics of reproductive form without grounding such abstractions in the tangible reality of classroom practices.

Secondly, I find many aspects of the reproduction argument to be overdeterministic and, in an important sense, fatalistic. Schools are seen as bearing the brunt of capitalist ideology and school people as relatively impotent in changing the process of ideological imposition and domination. For example, Bowles and Gintis see schools as engulfed in "the correspondence principle." The authors perceive the relationship between school and society in fairly straightforward terms: "The educational system helps integrate youth into the economic system, we believe, through a structured correspondence between its social relations and those of production... By attuning young people to a set of social relationships similar to those of the work place, schooling attempts to gear the development of personal needs to its requirements."[15] Thus the nature of schooling can be understood in terms of how it serves the needs of a specific form of economic production. There exists a clear, identifiable, and determining relationship between how schools function and the demands of capital.

Several writers have attempted to show how resistances to and mediations of the demands of the economic sphere make such a theory of economic reproduction overly simplistic.[16] Paul Willis, for example, urges rejection of such a simplistic correspondence view.[17] In his study of working class secondary school students in England, Willis argues that not all individuals "buy into" the official culture of the school. Resistances to the dominant culture occur, in part, because of its lack of meaning for those with different sets of cultural symbols and patterns. And yet the resistances to and outright rejection of the dominant culture by this group of working class boys (dubbed "the lads") contains the seeds of their own social class reproduction. "In penetrating the dominant school culture, in exposing it as foreign and alienating to their own experience, 'the lads' implicitly further sexual and economic divisions,"[18] by asserting their preference for masculine working class jobs

that involve manual rather than mental labor. In opposing the dominant ideology of the society as symbolized in the culture of the school, and reacting against this ideology and culture, this group solidifies its own economic position and class standing.

Again, I find such analyses instructive and pioneering in their exposition of how dominant ideologies serve to constrict and deflect personal meanings. Yet they may also, in an ironic and somewhat surprising way, give rise to their own brand of functionalism with regard to the role of schooling. If school practices are determined by social forces outside the school, and if even overt resistances to and mediations of these forces ultimately sustain the very ideological forces they were designed to resist or mediate, the temptation to regard any efforts at overcoming such a dominant ideology as at best impotent, or at worst regressive, seems fairly powerful. Such a sceptical orientation may in fact serve to propegate a kind of paralysis among those concerned with the ideological connotations of schooling. If the process of cultural and economic reproduction is so dominant as to prefigure both what schools do and possible alternatives to these processes, a sense of futility might well accompany attempts at educational and curriculum transformation.

This paper addresses these reservations regarding theories of economic and cultural reproduction by examining a specific set of curriculum materials in aesthetic education, to help demystify the connection between ideology and school practice; and by analyzing how the theoretical foundations for these materials serve an important ideological role. Finally, we will briefly consider the issue of how, in spite of such connections (and, ironically, in part <u>because</u> of them), aesthetic meanings may be instrumental in creating new educational and political possibilities for intervention which will not serve to further cement, as it were, capitalist ideology into the very bricks

and mortar of our educational system. By analyzing the form and content of the Aesthetic Education Program developed by the Central Midwestern Regional Education Laboratory (CEMREL), we will better understand how ideological elements filter through and become an accepted part of the actual programs which comprise school experience. At the same time, we will begin to understand how aesthetic meanings may play a significant role in interventionist-oriented strategies which can help serve as a counter to more deterministic theories of economic and cultural reproduction. At the heart of this essay, then, lies a commitment to improving school practice in a way that will not prove to be ideologically self-defeating.

II AESTHETIC EDUCATION AND CULTURAL REPRODUCTION

i Curriculum and aesthetic foundations for aesthetic education

The program in aesthetic education developed by CEMREL was directly inspired by a series of conferences and seminars held during the 1960's and sponsored by the Arts and Humanities Program of The U. S. Office of Education. Between October, 1964 and November, 1966, seventeen such meetings were held in this country, thirteen of which were directly supported by the Arts and Humanities Program. While a proposal to set up an institute that would be devoted to basic research into the nature of and possibilities for aesthetic education was rejected by The Office of Education, this group was invited to submit an alternative proposal "which would concern itself with the development of curriculum in aesthetic education directed at general education in the elementary and secondary schools..."[19] With the subsequent submission and approval of such a revised proposal, CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program was to be given birth.

The group of educators and scholars included in this Program divided their work into two phases. The initial phase was concerned with the

philosophical and curricular foundations upon which a program of aesthetic education might rest. In accomplishing this end, this group was to "give particular attention to substantive and methodological problems," in aesthetics and curriculum development.[20] Phase II of the Aesthetic Education Program was to deal with the actual production, testing, and evaluation of aesthetic education materials. Those involved in Phase II were, essentially, to design materials which embodied the concepts outlined in the previous phase of the Program.[21] Thus it is crucial to see the conceptual foundations in aesthetics and curriculum and the associated curriculum materials as essentially conjoined, within the activities sponsored by CEMREL. Both empirically and logically, the curriculum model and aesthetic understandings developed in this project cannot be separated from the actual material products which resulted.

The selection of a curriculum development model within the Aesthetic Education Program was shaped by several complimentary factors. First, in considering the three basic referents for building a curriculum, namely the learner, contemporary society, and subject specialists,[22] those involved in this aspect of the program concluded that there existed no substantive agreement among curriculum theorists as to the relative importance of each of these sources. The only conclusion drawn in this regard, thus, was that "curriculum development should begin with decisions about the referents."[23]

Secondly, an important consideration for a curriculum development model was an emphasis on constructing a set of materials for national, rather than local or regional, distribution. Because of this concern for nationwide dissemination, it was felt that sources for curriculum which involved studies of the learner or of the society would adversely restrict the curriculum program which resulted. That is, it was felt that because the U. S. is a diversified country, generalizations about the society or about learners would not have a high degree of validity. Moreover, the disciplines were

selected as the main source for curriculum development because "intellectual discourse is relatively unaffected by ethnic background, geographical location, community values, etc."[24] Thus the arts were chosen as the main source for curriculum development.

Thirdly, the Aesthetic Education Program was housed in an already existing educational laboratory, with definite commitments and perspectives. A certain amount of prestige or status attends the work of such federally-funded research laboratories which "necessitates adoption of organizational values consonant with their assumed responsibilities in education."[25] Because of the prestige which accompanies the work of laboratories such as CEMREL, and the high status educators and scholars which it attracts at least partially as a result, such educational agencies "make curriculum decisions not only in light of the arguments posed by the curriculum theorists, but also in light of the social and educational responsibilities as defined by their mission and prestige."[26] More specifically, in this regard, it was felt that "instructional materials similar to those that already existed in science, mathematics, and language arts were also needed to assist in curriculum development" in aesthetic education.[27]

Community and school acceptance, fourthly, were perhaps the key to determining a specific curriculum development model within the Aesthetic Education Program. Those involved in the design and production of these materials were sensitive to the fact that some curriculum materials involving aesthetic experiences might alienate schools and communities to the point where aesthetic education would be rejected by that school system. The materials for this program needed to be designed so that they would not be found objectionable by local groups and individuals, even though they were designed for national distribution. Part of this concern for school and community acceptance can be seen in the commitment to produce curriculum

materials in aesthetic education similar to those found in other subject areas. In addition, it was felt that "a curriculum which incorporates the values of the society to use it will have a greater chance of acceptance";[28] thus, a multiplicity of, or open-ended approach to, societal values would, on this view, further ensure the widespread acceptance of aesthetic education materials which was desired by those involved in the CEMREL venture. There was a commitment to value neutrality within this project, and to producing materials that would not, as it were, rock the social and educational boat.

For all these reasons, the curriculum workers at CEMREL decided on a system of instructional packages as the model for curriculum making. Such a system, it was felt, would: 1) be able to utilize the expertise of subject matter specialists in the arts;[29] 2) offer a system conducive to national distribution and implementation in that it would be consistent with curriculum development efforts in other subject areas; 3) be sensitive to the "status and prestige" consideration noted above which accompany the work of educational laboratories; and 4) allow enough flexibility to help assure school and community acceptance. A concern for educational respectability and acceptability thus dominated the thinking of those involved in this aspect of the program: a system of instructional packages was selected "to permit maximum flexibility for arrangement. The series of packages will be used by a school system as if it were a deck of cards; that is, shuffling order or sequence of units adaptable to variation in school settings and organizational patterns."[30]

The materials were to be designed along typical curricular lines involving scope and sequence, with different activities to be undertaken at suggested grade levels. Individual lessons were to be similarly divided into smaller components, with descriptions of the "concept," "objective," and "procedure" that would be pursued and utilized during the lesson. The materials were to be organized and sequenced along the lines of many curriculum

kits to be, in effect, "teacher proof." Instructions in the teacher guides were to be specific, systematic, and detailed, with little room for "error." In short, "all packages [were] designed with the general classroom teacher in mind. Each teacher package includes a guide to general and specific objectives, evaluation, classroom management, and step-by-step lesson plans as well as all necessary media materials."[31] The individual instructional units in CEMREL's program of aesthetic education form a self-contained, autonomous system to which little or no experience or expertise need be brought by the classroom teacher.

In terms of the philosophical or conceptual positions in aesthetics upon which a curriculum program might be constructed, several considerations seem important. As distinct from art education or appreciation, those involved in this program saw aesthetic education as a broader, more encompassing area of study. Rather than emphasizing the construction of artifacts in the various art forms, both the arts and the environment were to be utilized as examples of objects or events of aesthetic interest. As such the Aesthetic Education Program sought to complement instruction in the arts rather than to supplant it.[32]

Input into the conceptual foundations for this portion of the Program came from numerous sources, and in some respects an eclectic approach to this segment of CEMREL's activities was undertaken.[33] On the other hand, many of the theoretical positions and assumptions which became incorporated into this program revolve around issues with which there was substantial agreement. In particular, there seems to be a high degree of consensus, within the writings of those who were influential in this phase of the program, on issues dealing with the nature, function, and value of the aesthetic experience. Let us look briefly, then, at how these specific areas were conceptualized by those involved in the Aesthetic Education Program.[34]

A central idea in any program of aesthetic education is some conception of the nature of aesthetic experience. Within the work of CEMREL, it has been alleged by Stanley S. Madeja, formerly Director of the Program, and Sheila Onuska, that for students, "Aesthetic education in its simplest form is learning how to perceive, judge, and value the aesthetic in their lives."[35] Further, Evan J. Kern has suggested that there "appears to be some support for the thesis that it [aesthetic education] should strive to provide a deeper understanding and appreciation for the aesthetic qualities of natural and man-made objects and events in the environment."[36]

Yet what precisely are the aesthetic qualities of our experiences with man-made and natural objects? What does it mean to learn how to perceive the aesthetic in our lives and, in appreciating this, enhance our aesthetic sensibilities? Here Madeja and Onuska illuminate a central conceptual understanding shared by virtually all the scholars, administrators, and educators who had a hand in shaping the CEMREL undertaking:

> Aesthetic education is... learning how to perceive, judge, and value aesthetically what we come to know through our senses...
>
> For example, the aesthetic perception of a painting requires us to view its shapes, textures, colors, and other inherent visual elements and to interpret them into a whole conceptualization in which visual stimuli are converted into other sensory images... This kind of perception has nothing to do with values extrinsic to the painting as it exists on its own, such values as how much it is worth, how large it is, how it fits into the history of art, or whether it will go with the draperies.[37]

Such a position is reinforced by the view that, although a definitive version of what constitutes the aesthetic experience- in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions- may never be forthcoming, it is still the case that, "there is enough consensus among theorists to propose a functional concept of its nature: AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE IS AN EXPERIENCE WHICH IS VALUED INTRINSICALLY, an experience which is valued for itself."[38] That is, aesthetic

experience is self-enclosed, not a means to any alterior end point or aim. This view of the aesthetic leans heavily on an interpretation of the Greek "aisthesis," meaning "perception," wherein what becomes of interest and value aesthetically are the sensuous qualities of objects which are made available through our senses. Thus as Harry S. Broudy, a former member of CEMREL's National Advisory Committee, puts this point, "Whenever we concentrate attention on the appearance of houses, dress, sea shells, faces, automobiles, on the dramatic structure of events and actions, we are responding aesthetically. We can think of the aesthetic domain as including our experience with the appearances of natural objects and constructed ones."[39] The appearance of objects and events is here viewed as the embodiment of the aesthetic, and it is in such appearances that aesthetic value resides. Perception of an object's formal or sensuous qualities thus becomes the distinctive mode of aesthetic apprehension.[40]

A further insight into this characterization of aesthetic experience is provided by Eugene F. Kaelin, also a former member of the National Advisory Committee of CEMREL. In considering the response of perceivers to an aesthetic object, Kaelin says, "In order to insure relevance from the outset, we may start with effectuating 'the phenomenological epoche,' i.e., attend only to the object as it conditions our present experience. Husserl referred to this practice as 'putting the world into brackets'; more accurately, one could say 'outside the brackets' which enclose our present state of consciousness as it is directed to its object"; and, in the process, Kaelin continues, "we consider the experience of the object for what it is, rather than as a sign for an occurrent phenomenon of nature... [This bracketing of consciousness] may be the only practicable means available to the person who would come to an understanding of the data of an immediate experience. And only in those can intrinsic values be found."[41] In aesthetic experience

we are instructed to bracket off from attention all but the phenomenal properties of the object under attention. In this way we may come to perceive and appreciate the object in and of itself, and to value it intrinsically. Such a phenomenological emphasis on the "sensuous surface" of works of art as the carrier of aesthetic meaning lends further support to the views of Broudy in regard to the nature of aesthetic response discussed above; it also complements the views of Madeja and Onuska, as well as others, who were involved in the conceptual portion of CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program. What becomes important in this approach to aesthetic experience is the look, sound, touch, etc., of the actual object or event which stands or takes place before us.

The upshot of such phenomenologically-oriented perspectives is important for the purposes of this paper. In focusing on the presentational qualities of aesthetic experience, Broudy is lead to suggest that, "Whatever meaning or import the aesthetic object has it displays on its surface."[42] It follows from such views that, "Insofar as the realm of the aesthetic is the realm of appearnce enjoyed for its own sake, it demands no commitment to action."[43] Aesthetic experience is, in this way, essentially apolitical and non-ideological. Even more dramatically, Broudy instructs us that, "it is naive to believe that art cannot endanger morals. It can if the viewer is unable to perceive art objects aesthetically, and the untrained perceiver is likely to have this infirmity."[44] The realm of the aesthetic is conceived almost exclusively in phenomenological and perceptual terms, a domain composed of appearances we enjoy for their own sake. Given this characterization of aesthetic experience, any commitment to action does seem a rather distant, remote possibility, belonging more properly to other domains or areas of study; just as moral considerations seem patently irrelevant within such experience, even to be dismissed as an "infirmity" if allowed to intrude within the brackets of our perceptual apparatus.

What emerges from the work of CEMREL, hence, is the view that aesthetic experience is: 1) essentially related to the sensual appearance of objects; 2) intrinsically valuable, to be judged for its own sake, in and of itself; 3) not importantly connected to actions and experiences which are external to the experience itself; and 4) fundamentally concerned, in sum, with the phenomenal properties of objects, and as a result is amoral, apolitical, and non-ideological.

The actual materials which comprise the Aesthetic Education Program represent a blending of these theoretical positions in aesthetics with the curriculum development model outlined earlier. Several aspects from each of these areas mutually reinforce and help give legitimacy to each other. Recall that a central concern of those involved in the formulation of curriculum materials was that such materials not jeopardize school and community acceptance of aesthetic education; there was a conscious effort to remain as neutral as possible in regard to educational values and ideas. Avoidance of conflict was a central aim of those involved in this portion of CEMREL's activities. This emphasis seems furthered by the apolitical, non-ideological depiction of aesthetic experience discussed above. Both impulses seek to avoid valuational and ideological conflicts within materials designed to foster aesthetic education.

There is a self-contained, abstracted autonomy also evident in the positions taken in the curricular and aesthetic portions of the Aesthetic Education Program. Just as the curriculum model evidences a concern for completeness within these materials, as can be seen in the step-by-step nature of the lessons, prespecified objectives and means of attaining them, "error-proof" activities, and so on; so those who conceptualized the nature of the aesthetic experience conceived of the aesthetic as separated from other activities and ideas, to be undertaken and valued "in and of itself,"

or "for its own sake." Both the curricular and aesthetic considerations of the program argue for a view of the aesthetic which abstracts it from other experiences, ideas, and beliefs. In doing so "the aesthetic" is given, to a large extent, a life of its own. With these theoretical considerations in mind, let us look at one specific curriculum unit within the program, to see how such ideas became part of the actual materials which make up the Aesthetic Education Program.

ii The content of the Aesthetic Education Program

Those engaged in producing the CEMREL materials, Phase II of this project, designed the Program around a series of six levels or "centers of attention." In all, fourty-four instructional packages were developed by the CEMREL staff (see Appendix I). Though all these units were field tested in classroom settings, to date only ten such units have been published by Comenius, Inc.[45] These ten units comprise the Aesthetic Education Program as it has been made available to schools and teachers across the country.

For purposes of the present analysis, we will focus on one of these units, "Relating Sound and Movement," which is a part of the curriculum materials for level three, "Aesthetics and the Creative Process." Let us look at this unit as a representative example of the content incorporated into CEMREL's program in aesthetic education.

As the title for this curriculum unit intimates, this package of aesthetic education materials is designed to help students explore and experience "continuums within pitch, tempo and amount of intensity in sound; within amount of space, amount of time, and amount of force in movement,"[46] This unit contains seven lessons that are aimed at helping the student explore various relationships between sound and movement: "matching sound with movement, contrasting the two, and, finally, interpreting his experiences

with sound and movement and sharing with other students and the teacher the evaluation of his progress."[47]

In centering on the relationship between movement and sound, three sets of categories are specifically selected as guides: high-low, fast-slow, and loud-soft/strong-weak continuums. These are, however, only particular means to a more general end, namely the intentional relating of sound and movement as aesthetic elements, and perceiving these in works of art. "Thoughtful exploration and self evaluation by the students" is thus explicitly encouraged, rather than proficiency as such.

The general concept for this unit is that, "in a music-dance event, there is a fusion of sound and movement, and the resulting relationship produces an integrated expressive effect on the spectator."[48] The general goal of these materials is, thus, that "the student should increase his capacity to experience a dance-music event by perceiving several relationships between sound and movement."[49] Through identification of the sound and movement components of certain artistic performances, and an increased sensitivity to the relationship that exists between them, the resultant aesthetic experience should be of a deeper or more significant sort. The total instruction time for this unit, intended for use with second grade pupils, is six to eight hours.

Lesson one in the "Relating Sound and Movement" kit is a pre-test which is used to evaluate students' ability to distinguish between sounds that are high and low, fast and slow, and loud and soft; and between movements that can be similarly categorized. This pre-test consists of two discrete parts, one for each of these two aesthetic elements. The instructions for the sound pre-test are completely contained on the record enclosed in this curriculum unit, just as the film included with the other materials contains all directions for the movement pre-test. Answer sheets for both tests are also included, as is the answer key for each of the examinations.

The sound portion of the pre-test contains three parts. Part A involves four pairs of sound patterns. Students are asked to listen to each pair and decide whether the second sound pattern is higher or lower than the first. The answer they think is correct is then circled on the provided answer sheet for lesson one. The musical selections which appear on the record are relatively simple, involving the same basic melody being repeated in a different pitch.

Part B of this pre-test asks students to distinguish between faster and slower musical selections. Students are again provided with four pairs of musical recordings, preceded by a "practice example." These sound patterns are also relatively simple, with a selection being played once and then repeated at an obviously slower or faster pace. Students circle the response they feel is correct on their answer sheets- again comparing the second selection to the first and deciding whether it is played "faster" or "slower." The melodies provided are fairly simple, played on a single musical instrument.

The final portion of the sound pre-test, Part C, asks students to distinguish between loud and soft sound patterns. Once again four pairs of selections appear on the record, preceded by a practice example. After listening to each pair of musical pieces, students are to decide whether the second selection is louder or softer than the first. The second selection in each pair represents, once more, a repetition of the first, played either louder or softer.

After completing these three parts of the sound pre-test, students are told to pass their papers in to their teacher, who then corrects them using the accompanying answer key.

The film which serves as a pre-test for the movement activities contains scenes of six different activities being carried out by one or more

children on a playground. The students are to watch these activities and, for each, "see what the movement [within each scene] shows the most." After watching each scene, students are to decide which of three categories best describes the movement depicted in each activity. They are then to mark their answer on the provided answer sheet (this instruction is read by the narrator of the film and appears visually on the screen). After marking their response on the answer sheet for a given activity, there is a slight pause, followed by a repetition of the same scene. This is done so that students can "check their answers" and "be sure" they are correct.

The six activities pictured on the film show:

1) a girl skipping rope;

2) two boys involved in a "tug of war" game;

3) a boy throwing a ball into the air and catching it, bending at the knees as it comes to him;

4) four children playing tag;

5) a boy using his arms and hands to move across a horizontal "ladder" on some playground equipment;

6) four children on a manually-operated merry-go-round which begins each revolution slowly and then gradually gains momentum until the beginning of the next revolution.

For each of these activities, students are asked to select, from three specific pairs of descriptive words, that pair which best captures what that activity demonstrates. Students are given the choices "high and low" and "strong and weak" as possible descriptors for each of the six scenes. In addition, for activities four through six, the pair "fast and slow" is added as a possible descriptor; while "loud and soft," "big and little," and "wide and narrow," respectively, constitute additional alternatives for activities one, two, and three. The student, then, marks one of these three pairs of words following each activity presented in the film that describes

the movement contained in each of the six scenes. The film, which runs for approximately five minutes, ends with the suggestion that, "next time you are playing, see if you can guess what your movement is showing."

When scoring the movement pre-test, the teacher is asked to pay special attention to students who answer more than three of the six questions incorrectly. Students missing more than half the questions are to look at the enclosed Continuum Book, which contains photographs of six kinds of movements- high, low, strong, weak, fast, and slow. Looking at and studying the pictures in the Continuum Book is supposed to aid students having difficulty understanding movement qualities.

Lesson two of the "Relating Sound and Movement" curriculum unit deals with the different timbres within sound patterns. By breaking down sound into specific components, and then studying these components, it is felt that students will become more knowledgeable in their perception of sound events; this then forms the concept for lesson two. The stated objective is that, "the student will explore sound elements by listening to sounds of varying timbres within the continuums of high-low (pitch), loud-soft (intensity), and fast-slow (tempo) and by producing his own sounds within each of these continuums."[50]

Lesson two begins with the teacher displaying the "Sound and Movement" chart included in the curriculum materials for this unit. This chart has two sides, "Matching" and "Contrasting," with columns of words listed under "sound" and "movement" on each side. At the same time as this chart is being displayed, the teacher is to indicate the dynamics of sound and movement (high-low, fast-slow, loud-soft/strong-weak). Following this, students are divided into groups of three or four pupils each, and the selections for lesson two played on the enclosed record.

Various sounds are heard on this recording: a bottle partially filled with water (exhibiting "high" and "fast" sound qualities); an empty bottle (producing "lower" and "slower" sounds); and various voice and clapping sounds exhibiting other qualities. Objects collected earlier (pencils, blocks of wood, etc.) are to be explored to see what kinds of sound qualities students can make with them. Homemade instruments are also discussed- a one-string "guitar" that can be used to achieve different pitches, intensities, and tempos, for example. The emphasis throughout the lesson is on achieving various sound effects by creating sound patterns using whatever objects or materials are available, including voices and hands. The important point for this lesson is that "students explore and experience the six sound qualities and be able to discriminate among them."[51] Students are encouraged to make sounds and sound patterns that will, thus, be high, low, loud, soft, fast, and slow, exploring the possible continuums in each area.

The use of voices by students is especially encouraged, with groups investigating each of the three continuums of sound. It is also suggested that the teacher tape record each of the continuums within each group, playing back the recording so students can discuss the various sound patterns and qualities produced.

Lesson three parallels the second lesson, while focusing on the components of movement rather than sound. Using the Continuum Book, students are to "explore movement by looking at examples of high, low, strong, weak, fast, and slow."[52] In addition, each student is to develop one example of each of these movements using his/her body movements and shadow. By studying the components of movement, it is felt that students will develop a greater understanding and perception of a movement event.

The first step in lesson three is for the teacher to tell the class, divided into groups of three or four each: "Find high, low, strong, weak,

fast and slow movements that your body can do."[53] To aid in this assignment, the teacher hands out "flashlight belts" to each group. These consist of small flashlights with adjustable belts attached that can be opened and closed to accommodate a variety of sizes. Working in a darkened room, the belts are to be worn by students on any part of their body; they then follow the movement made by the flashlight on the floor, wall, or ceiling. They are to experiment with various movement patterns by moving that part of their body to which the flashlight belt has been attached. A further activity for this lesson involves putting a lamp in front of a wall in a darkened room. Working between the lamp and the wall, students watch the shadow created and experiment with different forms of movement.

The Continuum Book is also used to illustrate kinds of body movement. Again the emphasis in these activities is on students actively exploring different movements, rather than on accuracy per se. The teacher is instructed to "positively reinforce serious effort and any semblence of success during the initial stages of exploring movement."[54] As students gain confidence in their movement ability, the emphasis becomes placed on clarity, so that others watching the movement could guess what that movement is by looking at the person doing it.

The last phase of this lesson involves having students create movements using the flashlight belts and lamp, with each group demonstrating at least one example of each kind of movement. The essence of this lesson is "the students' exploration of movement, and their perception of the kinesthetic experience of high or strong or slow, etc."[55]

Lesson four combines elements from sound and movement by matching the corresponding elements of these two aesthetic components. The relationship between sound and movement is explored first by students matching movements to sounds they hear, and then by matching sounds to movements they see.

The concept of matching is discussed in the context of sound and movement, and how high sounds can be matched with high movements, and so on. The "Matching" half of the enclosed chart is to be displayed, noting how the terms, when read across, correspond to each other. For example, "loud" on the sound portion corresponds to "strong" on the movement side, "soft" with "weak," and so on. Throughout this lesson similarities or commonalities such as these are to be emphasized.

Subsequently, the recording which accompanies lesson four is to be played. Various sounds are heard on the record ("high," "low," "loud," "soft," fast," and "slow"). Students are asked to name movements they think would match the sounds they hear on the record. They are to name specific activities that might show the kinds of movements which match the sounds on this recording. Following this, the recording for lesson four is to be played again, this time asking the students to match the sounds by actually making the movements they suggested earlier. A possible list of such movements is included in the teacher's guide for this unit. The repeated playing of sounds for this lesson is suggested as an aid in students making new movements or improving on previous ones.

The second half of lesson four involves having students match sounds to movements they observe. Grouping students in pairs, one person from each group selects a word from the movement column of the displayed chart. This person then demonstrates the movement selected to the other person in his/her pair. The latter student watches the movement and attempts to match a sound to it. Any instrument, object, or voice quality can be used to match the movement acted out. After having completed this activity, the roles are reversed, with each student taking the responsibility for the other half of the matching activity. This continues until all six movement qualities have been attempted by both students in each group. An optional activity for this

lesson is having students tape record environmental or household sounds, presumably then creating movements which match these sounds.

Relating sound and movement in terms of their possible contrast is the central concept for lesson five in this series. This lesson involves the students investigating another possible interaction between these two aesthetic elements, namely the oppositional character that can characterize their relationship. Activities included in this lesson involve students in listening to sounds to which a contrasting movement can be created, and vice-versa.

Using the "contrasting" side of the supplied chart, the teacher introduces the concept of contrasting. This portion of the chart is also arranged in two columns ("sound" and "movement") which, when read across, reveal contrasting dynamics between each category; there are six pairs of words arranged on the chart in this way. Students are once again divided into groups of two for this activity, and asked to consider the first set of paired words ("high" [sound] and "low" [movement]) on the chart. Each group of students is to decide which person will create the movement and which will provide the sound component for this lesson. Using the first word grouping from the chart, then, one student will begin by producing a high sound which the other student will respond to with a low movement. The next sound/movement coupling indicated on the chart, "low" (sound) and "high" (movement), is also acted out by each group of students. Following this, the order is reversed, with the movement student initiating and the other student responding. Finally, the roles within each group are reversed. Throughout this activity, students are discouraged from verbalizing what each person <u>means</u> by their sound or movement event, relying instead on each person attentively watching and listening to their partner. It is also suggested that throughout the activity partners be switched to avoid repetition.

The other four word pairs appearing on the chart are also to be acted out in pairs, either at the students' own pace or at the direction of the teacher. The teacher is also instructed to ask, "Which contrast was most difficult for you? Why do you think so?"[56] Finally, examples of contrasts are to be elicited from different groups of students.

Lesson six involves an integration of the previous lessons in the "Relating Sound and Movement" unit. The concept for this lesson is that particular, intentional combinations of sound and movement will produce a "rudimentary form of a dance-music work of art."[57] The objective for this lesson is for the students to develop "sound-movement statements" that will include samples of both matching and contrasting sounds and movements. As well, students are to evaluate their own work, along with the teacher.

This lesson begins with a review of the concepts covered in previous lessons, by the teacher asking five specific questions, as enunciated in the teacher's guide. The specific questions to be asked are as follows:

1. In the first lesson, we listened to a record and watched a film to see if we could hear sounds that were _____, _____, _____, _____, _____, and _____. Can you tell me what the sounds were like? We tried to see which movements showed _____, _____, _____, _____, _____, and _____. Can you remember what the movements were like?

2. Then in lesson 2 we tried to find our own sounds that did these six things. Did we find out anything about making these sounds?

3. In lesson 3 we worked with our own movements. What did we find out in doing this?

4. Lessons 4 and 5 had us put sounds and movements together. We did this in two ways. What was the first way? What does 'matching' mean? Can you give an example?

5. What was the other way we related sound and movement? What does 'contrasting' mean? What is an example?[58]

Possible answers to these questions are also provided in the teacher's guide for each of these five review questions.

After the review of these sound and movement concepts, students are divided into groups of four or five pupils each, with each group going to a different area of the classroom. Each group is given the following specific tasks: 1) to make at least five movements and five sounds, some of which match and some of which contrast; and 2) to decide how their combination of sounds and movements should fit together, practicing this arrangement. After sufficient practice, each group sits together to present their sound/movement exercise and evaluate the activities of the other groups. To aid in the process of evaluation, each group is numbered and given an "observation sheet" from the materials included with this curriculum kit.

The observation sheet contains four questions, the first three of which are to be answered on the sheet itself, by one person from each group, after discussion within the group; the fourth question on the observation sheet is to serve as a guide for class discussion. Question one asks students to circle any of the twelve categories that apply to either sound or movement events which appear on the chart for this unit, and which were discussed in previous lessons. Questions two and three ask, respectively, if students saw any matching or contrasting in the exercises completed by each group. The last question asks the students what they liked best, and least, about each group's presentation, as well as how it could be made better. All observation sheets are then collected, and redistributed to the appropriate group. The last step in this process is for each group to evaluate its own "dance-music work of art."

The concluding lesson in this curriculum unit involves perceiving and appreciating the sound and movement aspects of an actual music-dance event. The students watch the film, "Fogarty Park," included with the other materials, and discuss the relationship between sound and movement contained in this film.

The film itself, approximately four minutes in length, contains a variety of scenes (some apparently repeated from the movement pre-test film seen in lesson one) and musical accompaniment. There are about fifteen different scenes depicted, with music ranging from a slow, melancholy flute solo at the beginning, to a faster, lighter ensemble involving a flute, guitar, and another reed instrument in the middle, to a brisk guitar solo at the end which becomes increasingly loud as the film concludes. The scenes include a shot from the ground looking up at the sun shining through a stand of trees, children playing on various pieces of outdoor playground equipment, a boy catching a ball, children playing tag, and children going down a slide. In all, the film and music exhibit most if not all of the qualities associated with sound and movement that were discussed in the lessons contained in the curricular unit under discussion here.

Discussion of "Fogarty Park" is to be initiated by the teacher asking the class questions such as:

> Can you remember any point in the film where the music seemed to match the movement? When?
>
> Can you remember times where the music contrasted with the movement?
>
> When did you think the music and movement went together very well?
>
> Did you think there were times when the music was not right for the movement? When?
>
> Did you think there were moments when the sound and movement fitted together and made one beautiful thing? When?[59]

Based on these kinds of inquiries by the teacher, students are to discuss their reactions to the film, focusing on how sound and movement patterns work together in this production. This, then, is to be the culminating activity for this unit, wherein students are to apply what they have learned about the relationships between sound and movement to make appreciation or understanding of a specific work deeper and more sophisticated.

iii Cultural reproduction and aesthetic education

The curriculum unit dealing with the relationship between sound and movement can be understood, of course, at several levels. For present purposes the linkages between its aesthetic and curriculum foundations on the one hand, and the material content of this instructional unit on the other, seem most pertinent in terms of explicating how this program serves a reproductive function. The assumptions which guided the development of curricular and aesthetic meanings, as these are manifest in CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program, can be seen as serving specific ideological ends.

Perhaps most striking in this regard is the extent to which the people involved in the Program were successful in procuring the kind of program they desired. The units of instruction developed by CEMREL- as exemplified in the "Relating Sound and Movement" package- bear a striking resemblence to those developed in other subject areas. This was, to reiterate, one of the central aims of the Program which, if achieved, would presumably enhance the possibility of school and community acceptance, while upholding the organizational commitments and educational status of this regional laboratory. As the lessons and activities unfold within the unit of instruction examined here, the degree of success realized in pursuit of this aim became increasingly evident. In this regard the Program seems eminently to have succeeded.

That the curriculum workers associated with the Aesthetic Education Program were successful in the achievement of this goal seems all but unquestionable. That such a successful effort is necessarily to be applauded, however, seems less than obvious. For there are consequences attending this emphasis on school and community acceptance, and the patterns and meanings this emphasis entailed, that in my view adversely affect how aesthetic forms and the aesthetic experience are understood by both teachers and students who come into contact with these materials. There is, in other words, a price

to be paid for regarding the current set of educational and community sentiments as given, to be capitulated to by any set of curriculum materials which we may wish to proliferate.

The activities and exercies contained in the curriculum unit described above all share a basic utilitarian perspective, such that specific activities are to lead to the attainment of particular, prespecified ends. The reason for listening to a variety of musical selections, relating sound and movement characteristics, and so on, was to realize some pregiven end point thought desirable by those who, working outside the individual classroom in which the materials are to be utilized, conceptualized this program. Aesthetic experience so conceived becomes undertaken as a means to some external end, undertaken so that end may be accomplished. Moreover, the way in which the materials are designed and employed serves to separate conception from execution. Those responsible for developing the goals and objectives to which the exercises contribute are not involved in the actual use of the program in classrooms, and vice-versa. Teachers and students are divorced from the process of actually constructing materials which could embody specific, personal meanings and values.

The aesthetic response of students within these lessons is also highly standardized and routinized, with students expected to reach the same general goal or end point in more or less the same way, using more or less the same amount of time and procedures. For example, lessons four and five in the "Relating Sound and Movement" package deal with the relationship between various sounds and movements in terms of matching and contrasting. Not only are the categories here pre-determined, again by someone outside the classroom in which the activities take place, but the specific pairings are also prefigured by the use of the enclosed charts. Students are lead to see specific movements and hear specific counds in terms of a specifically defined relationship over which they have little or no control. Likewise, in the review activities

undertaken at the beginning of lesson six, specific, detailed questions are included in the teacher's guide to shape the discussion which is to ensue. Students are expected to answer these questions uniformly, with only one answer being "correct" for each question. Indeed the "fill in the blank" format for some of these questions overtly supports such a narrowing of what is to count as appropriate learning, of what it means to have accomplished the previously stated objectives. Thus activities are undertaken which lead to the same, prespecified result. This kind of standardization in response and outcome measures constricts what is to count as an aesthetic experience within this program in limiting those experiences to ones that achieve, or at least move toward, a pregiven end.

This tendency toward standardization of experience is further emphasized by the kinds of evaluation instruments and activities included in this curriculum package. This becomes fairly clear, for example, in the pre-test activities involved in lesson one of the sound and movement series. Choices are circumscribed by the answers provided on the included answer sheets, with little or no room for other interpretations or identifications. Again the emphasis becomes placed on standardization and uniformity of response in such situations; what counts as a successful identifcation of aesthetic concepts is narrowly delimited and standardized, with answers being either correct or not. The movement toward standardization of response may also be seen in other, less obvious ways, however. In watching "Fogarty Park" as a culminating activity for this unit, students are directed to focus their attention on specific sound/movement combinations as they occur in this film, to the exclusion of other possible activities, interpretations, and meanings. Indeed it seems that the only "content" embedded in the film, seen under these circumstances, are the sound/movement relationships that it allegedly exemplifies; what the actions and scenes may mean in other terms- either literal or symbolic- is left totally

unexplored. The only meaning of such a film is that uncovered by situating this work of art within the confines of antecedent exercises and objectives. Moreover, specific discussion questions follow this film which serve to again orient students toward the categories established in previous lessons. Student response is judged in terms of how well sound and movement relationships are undertood based on previous discussions and understandings gleaned from prior activities. Such tendencies constrict and deflect personal interpretations and meanings which might otherwise become manifest.

Another interlocking effect of the curriculum and aesthetic content of the unit on sound and movement is the highly segmented, isolated nature of the aesthetic experiences which result. This unit, though dealing with two aesthetic categories, utilizes only a comparatively small portion of those categories. Only a specific aspect of musical forms (their pitch, tempo, and intensity) and movement patterns (their space, time, and force) are used to illustrate the desired outcomes. Musical and movement understandings, thus, become centered on these components, isolated from other aspects of music and movement as well as from their relationship to other art forms and activities. "Music" and "movement" as aesthetic categories become abstracted from real life situations in this process, with specific characteristics of each disected for scrutiny. Such aesthetic forms are not seen from any larger perspective, but rather as self-contained, fragmented areas which are valued apart from other categories and meanings. The result is a sense of "unreality" about the activities undertaken, as they have little or no connection with other human concerns, values, and commitments. To put this point another way, it might be the case that students who experience and investigate the unit dealing with sound and movement relationships learn something about the formal qualities of these aesthetic forms, and the surface features of each; but it seems unlikely that they will understand the value or importance of using

these mediums as vehicles of personal or social expression. They are, in a real sense, emasculated in the process.

Most if not all of these factors surrounding the development of aesthetic meanings in CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program, of course, work together and help reinforce each other. The fact that these materials exhibit a utilitarian perspective leading to prespecified, particular ends is directly related to the tendency toward standardization, routinization, and segmentation, for example. Indeed it is at least in part the mutually supportive role each of these characteristics play in the development of specific aesthetic meanings that accounts for the potency of this program.

These several tendencies coalesce in still other ways which shape the aesthetic meanings embedded in CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program. The picture of the aesthetic which emerges is one in which aesthetic elements are valued in terms of how well they are aligned with specific, desired outcomes.

An important part of this valuational aspect of aesthetic forms results from the fact that not only are the ends of instruction prespecified, but the means of attaining these as well. Frequently throughout the units examined here, as noted above, specific questions and inquiries are detailed in the relevant teacher's manual to aid in shaping the discussion which takes place among students, and which contributes to the realization of the desired objective. "Discovery" or "creativity" on the students' part are frequently prefigured or circumscribed, leaving students to figure out the correct response as determined by the teacher, in consultation with the curriculum materials.

Aesthetic meanings, hence, are seen as being manifested in the proper sequence of rationalized steps or procedures, completed in the proper manner, so that answers or activities match the correct response as given by some external agency or person. Such a view of aesthetic meanings perceives them

as discovered or uncovered in accordance with some external, pregiven standard or set of criteria, to be evaluated in terms of those criteria. Aesthetic meanings exist "out there," and if we but follow the proper directions carefully, we will be able to discover them.

Thus the view of aesthetic knowledge or understanding which is embedded in the materials developed by CEMREL is one wherein students have a relatively passive role. Aesthetic knowledge involves something specific that is to be uncovered by students in the process of reaching a prespecified end. Using one or more of the senses, students are to discover aesthetic meanings through a series of specific actions on or with the environment. Instead of actively constructing aesthetic meanings in concert with others, such meanings are external to the person himself or herself, to be uncovered via the proper application or replication of activities which revolve around the use of our senses.

In sum, the aesthetic meanings implicit in CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program show the following characteristics: 1) aesthetic experiences have utility insofar as they lead to some external objective or end point; 2) the specific activities undertaken are relatively standardized or routinized, in reaching these ends; 3) evaluation instruments and activities created to assess how well these ends have been achieved show a correlative degree of standardization; 4) aesthetic meanings are rationalized, segmented, and isolated from each other and from other concerns and areas of inquiry; 5) this results in a degree of abstraction from day to day experiences such that the aesthetic is seen as, in a sense, artificial and unreal (or, perhaps, merely decorative); and 6) aesthetic knowledge as contributory to the development and valuing of aesthetic meanings results from a passive role by the student within which the senses are used to discover the proper set of such meanings.

Such practices and patterns seem to reinforce and legitimate ways of thinking which have utility for capitalist ideology. The utilitarian perspective contributes to a way of thinking dominated by pragmatic concerns for ends and goals, rather than the quality of achieving these or their interrelationship. This way of thinking seems comforting for a society in which great stress is placed on the production and consumption of material goods, rather than on the process and consequences of producing and acquiring them. In a society where maximizing the number of goods and services is crucial for the perpetuation of the economic system, an emphasis on activities and objects as ends, and a correlative deemphasis on the results and side effects involved in this process, seems central. Thus producing curriculum materials which further this way of thinking about the world and our role in it may be seen as ideologically useful.

The tendency toward standardization and routinization of activities, as well as their evaluation, also serves to promote ways of thinking which complement current social practices. With the increased use of technology of a certain sort, standardization of tasks and assignments takes on a greater sense of being natural or desirable. The use of computerized forms within both "provate corporations" and state bureaucracies is but one example of how activities and communication patterns have become increasingly stylized and routinized. By designing educational experiences and pedagogical practices which foster a sense of routinization in interpersonal response and communication, we are preparing young people to accept forms of social interaction which have utility in the larger society.

The movement toward rationalization and segmentation of both work roles and interpersonal relations is reflected in how the materials within the Aesthetic Education Program are organized and presented. The tendency to segment, isolate, and depersonalize experience can be seen in a variety of

settings. Consider as examples the segmented tasks of blue collar factory workers and the "chain of command" communication patterns followed by large state bureaucracies. Such processes of segmentation and isolation have, in many cases, become a part of our collective consciousness, an unstated assumption in many kinds of activities. Through the tendency toward task analysis and specialized division of labor, experience becomes increasingly fragmented. Some of the qualities associated with the Aesthetic Education Program further these modes of thought and conduct.

A part of such segmentation can be seen in the fact that conception of activities and exercises which become a part of this program in aesthetic education are disconnected from the arenas where such conceptions are put into practice. In separating conception from execution in this way, at least two phenomena can be seen operating. On the one hand, teachers and teaching are being "deskilled," so that the craft of teaching becomes more closely aligned with managerial and administrative duties; this leads to a further emphasis on the individual as a concumptive and possessive being, rather than a reflective, constructive one.[60] On the other hand, students are tacitly lead to view themselves as removed from important decision-making responsibilities and mechanisms; they come to think of themselves as responding and conforming to external values, meanings, and commitments rather than constructing them.

Abstracting aesthetic experience from other life situations and regarding the role of aesthetic participants as passive serves other ideological functions. Both perpetuate an individualistic perspective in which the respondent is seen as separated from collectivities while at the same time relatively inactive within the experience itself. The fact of increased atomization and abstraction of individuals, with the shift to a market economy, has been well documented.[61] The point I wish to emphasize here is that many

of the activities which make up the Aesthetic Education Program correspond to and help accentuate this sense of individualism. It is true that some activities in the unit dealing with sound and movement involve students working in small groups on cooperative exercises. Yet the emphasis on individual interpretation and response, especially in the evaluation instruments and activities, may at the same time serve to ajudicate important "work" from unimportant "exercise" or "play."[62] Pre-tests and discussion-centered review sessions are predominantly individualistic. Again, for those who experience difficulty with lesson three, for example, which deals with various movement components, the remedial activity consists of students independently reviewing pictured movements in the Continuum Book. Such emphases, occurring as they do in the higher-status evaluational activities of classrooms, may tacitly serve to perpetuate the idea that collective activities are relatively less important than individual ones.

The program of aesthetic education developed by CEMREL serves to perpetuate ways of thinking and seeing that are ideologically useful, serving the help sustain the current social order, in the following ways. First, they further a utilitarian perspective which systematically deemphasizes the importance of the quality of processes and consequences, while accentuating the importance of goals and ends. Second, activities are provided which help further segment, fragment, and isolate experience, reinforcing the disjointedness of much of contemporary social life. Third, experience becomes depersonalized in this curriculum program, with students and teachers separated from the conceptual portion of these activities, and left in a relatively passive role. Fourth, experiences within the program are in important ways individualistic, further emphasizing personal separateness and the importance of individual participation over collective action. Through such emphases we can begin to see how tangible curricular and pedagogical practices contribute

to the establishment of world views, to ways of thinking, feeling, and seeing, which both respond to and help legitimate the social order in its present forms.

III BEYOND IDEOLOGICAL IMPOSITIONS

The previous sections of this essay clarify how ideological elements may permeate curriculum materials and programs, so that they appear to be "natural" or commonsensical components of the day to day exchanges which comprise school life. And yet it is dangerously easy, as noted at the outset, to engage in a kind of deterministic functionalism here, and fail to see the contradictions embedded in such exchanges; contradictions which may be exploited in responding to such ideological configurations. In the remainder of this paper I will briefly indicate why I believe aesthetic meanings may be an important component in the struggle to resist such ideological permutations, and why many of the extant theories of cultural reproduction may be overly deterministic in their view of how capitalist ideology imposes its will on the day to day lives of teachers and students.

Perhaps the first step in this undertaking would be to expose the very political and ideological elements of programs in aesthetic education which were discussed above. That is, it is assumed by many school people, just as it is by those involved in CEMREL's project, that "the aesthetic" is a politically and socially neutral enterprise, dealing with how things or people look, sound, feel, and so on. There is a prima facie prejudice against conceiving aesthetic concerns in political and social terms. And yet, if our analysis in the preceding sections is even close to correct, programs in aesthetic education do indeed contain implicit social and ideological commitments. The first step in demystifying the power of ideology might well involve a stripping away of this apolitical, non-ideological facade.[63]

Now such a process of demystification would necessarily involve a rethinking of those very philosophical and conceptual understandings, in curriculum and aesthetics, which give credence to this non-ideological, asocial perspective regarding aesthetic experience. A central component of the aesthetic experience as characterized by those partaking in the development of the CEMREL Program, it will be recalled, was that "Aesthetic education is... the training of imaginative perception to enable the pupil to apprehend sensory content, formed into an image that expresses some feeling quality. So stated, aesthetic education does not concern itself with propagandizing for any specific ideology or way of life."[64] While the term "propagandizing" is doubtless intentionally harsh here, the depolitization of aesthetic forms which such sentiments help mask, within programs such as CEMREL's, needs to be reexamined in a way which serves to make explicit the interconnections between social, ideological, and aesthetic forms.[65] This reexamination will provide an important step in analyzing the ideological content of projects like the Aesthetic Education Program, and in overcoming such ideological interjections.

An important and related consideration here concerns the training we provide teachers and other school personnel. Too often teacher preparation programs exhibit an emphasis on technique and methodology at the expense of more sustained, critical debates about the functions and possibilities of schooling, and the role of teachers in these issues. Especially in programs in elementary education, teacher education curricula are dominated by a technical perspective where current practices and proposals are assumed as natural or inevitable. Helping foster a more problematic, reflective approach to the training of teachers would be one way of identifying, exposing, and reacting against the ideological components of educational institutions.[66] It is easy for theorists of cultural and economic reproduction to forget, operating as they typically do at a macro-theoretical level, that "teachers"

and "administrators" do not just fill cretain social and educational roles but are also human beings with a potential for active subversion of the dominant ideology as this gets played out in schools.[67] By supporting such efforts, in teacher education programs and in the schools, and making our interventions more collective and focused, we may begin to expose and exploit the contradictions that are a part of all educational and social practice.

As I have argued elsewhere,[68] aesthetic experience has the potential to help us perceive our world, our relationship with our fellows, and our personal and ethical responsibilities, in new ways. Works of art have the capability, if approcahed in other than phenomenologically-oriented ways, of helping us see both current realities and future possibilities in ways that may not be available to other, more didactic forms of communication and expression. The way we come to think about situations, conflicts, and actions may be affected by the kinds and quality of aesthetic forms we experience, and the assumptions which undergird our experiences of them. Films such as "Apocalypse Now" and "Harlan County U.S.A." provide examples from the arts which, in containing powerful personal and social meanings, can change how we view ourselves and others, and ultimately how we act in our life situations.

For those who continue to see cultural and curricular practices as narrowly reproductive, I would suggest that we would benefit from a more sympathetic viewing of the actual materials offered by programs like CEMREL's. It is not the series of visual images flashing across the film screen, for example, that by themselves make such components, in a sense, reproductive. Indeed many of the artifacts and not a few of the exercises in this Program are aesthetically quite successful, viewed from perspectives other than those incorporated into the materials. In a sense, then, we already have a beginning with which to rethink and redirect our efforts in aesthetics and curriculum. By incorporating other aesthetic traditions into our curriculum and pedagogical

exchanges, by refusing to depoliticize culture in a way that has become almost commonsensical, we may breathe new life into some of the very aesthetic forms which make up the Aesthetic Education Program. This is not to say that we could uniformly incorporate every artifact and exercise into a more sophisticated, comprehensive program of aesthetic education; at the same time, however, we can not dismiss the possibility that at least some portion of this and other ventures into the aesthetic domain contain built-in contradictions that could help in the struggle against those ideological forms which currently help legitimate these very ventures.

What this would centrally ential, I believe, is a new commitment to aesthetics and curriculum that places social action and ethical conduct near its center, rather than dismissing such concerns as "extra-aesthetic." I would urge a rededication of efforts in aesthetic education, to the pursuit of "enlightened social action" rather than "enlightened cherishing."[69] A good place to begin, I would suggest, is by exposing the contradictions and possibilities of programs based on the latter supposition.

APPENDIX I

The Aesthetic Education Program Curriculum Units by Level and Center of Attention

LEVEL 1: AESTHETICS IN THE PHYSICAL WORLD	LEVEL 2: AESTHETICS AND ARTS ELEMENTS	LEVEL 3: AESTHETICS AND THE CREATIVE PROCESS	LEVEL 4: AESTHETICS AND THE ARTIST
Introduction to Space	Part and Whole	Examining Point of View	Critics
Introduction to Light	Texture	Arranging Sounds with Magnetic Tapes	Writers
Introduction to Sound	Shape	Creating Patterns of Duration and Pitch	Composers
Introduction to Motion	Tone Color	Creating Word Pictures	Visual Artists
	Rhythm/Meter	Relating Sound and Movement	Choreographers
	Sound in Poems and Stories	Creating Characterization	Actors
	Characterization	Constructing Dramatic Plot	Architects
	Dranatic Conflict	Forming Movement Phrases	Filmmakers
	Non-verbal Communication	Creating with Sounds and Images	
	Setting and Environment		
	Movement		

LEVEL 5: AESTHETICS AND THE CULTURE	LEVEL 6: AESTHETICS AND THE ENVIRONMENT
The United States: An Approach to Aesthetics	Environments are Places and People Together
The First Americans: An Approach to Aesthetics	Sensing Places
Mexico: An Approach to Aesthetics	Moving Through Environments
The Yoruba: An Approach to Aesthetics	You and Your Place
The U.S.S.R.: An Approach to Aesthetics	Cities Are...
Japan: An Approach to Aesthetics	Imagine a Place

SOURCE: Through the Arts to the Aesthetic, Stanley S. Madeja with Sheila Onuska (St. Louis, Missouri: CEMREL, Inc., 1977), pp. 16-17.

NOTES

[1] Willard Waller, The Sociology of Teaching (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1932), p. 20.

[2] Robert Dreeben, On What Is Learned in School (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1968), p. 4.

[3] See, for example, Walter Feinberg, Reason and Rhetoric: The Intellectual Foundations of Twentieth Century Liberal Educational Policy (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1975); and Clarence J. Karier, Shaping the American Educational State: 1900 to the Present (New York: The Free Press, 1975).

[4] Michael W. Apple, "Ideology, Reproduction, and Educational Reform," Comparative Education Review, XXII, October, 1973.

[5] Howard Ebmeier and Thomas L. Good, "The Effects of Instructing Teachers About Good Teaching on the Mathematics Achievement of Fourth Grade Students," American Educational Research Journal, Winter, 1979, Volume 16, Number 1, p. 1.

[6] Apple, "Ideology, Reproduction, and Educational Reform," op. cit.

[7] Dreeben, op. cit., p. 64.

[8] Stanley S. Madeja, "The CEMREL Aesthetic Education Program: A Report to the Field," Art Education, September 1973, Volume 26, Number 6, p. 11.

[9] Indeed the tendency to conceive of "the society" is revealatory here. The assumption that there exists some homogenous collectivity that does not contain deep and important differences and conflicts may be embedded in this way of talking about socialization. Yet one would like to know which society, or which aspects of the multitudinous portions thereof, such writers are referring to.

[10] Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America (New York: Basic Books, 1976).

[11] Michael F. D. Young, Knowledge and Control (London: Collier-MacMillan Publishers, 1971).

[12] Basil Bernstein, Class, Codes, and Control, Volume 3: Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975).

[13] Michael W. Apple, Ideology and Curriculum (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979).

[14] Pierre Bourdieu: "The School as a Conservative Force: Scholastic and Cultural Inequalities," in Schooling and Capitalism: A Sociological Reader, Roger Dale, et. al., editors (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976), p. 113.

[15] Bowles and Gintis, op. cit., p. 131.

[16] See, for example, Michael W. Apple, "The Other Side of the Hidden Curriculum: Correspondence Theories and the Labor Process," The Journal of Education, in press.

[17] Paul Willis, Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs (Lexington: D. C. Heath, 1977).

[18] Landon E. Beyer, "Schools, Aesthetic Forms, and Social Reproduction," paper presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April, 1979, p. 15.

[19] The Aesthetic Education Program: A Report on the Accomplishments, prepared for the National Institute of Education by the Aesthetic Education Program, CEMREL, Inc., 1976, p. v.

[20] Manural Barkan, Laura H. Chapman, and Evan J. Kern, Guidelines: Curriculum Development for Aesthetic Education (St. Louis, Missouri: CEMREL, Inc., 1970), p. ii.

[21] These concepts are detailed in Barkan, et. al., op. cit.

[22] Ralph W. Tyler, Basic Principles of Curriculum & Instruction (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950).

[23] Stanley S. Madeja and Harry T. Kelley, "A Curriculum Development Model for Aesthetic Education," The Journal of Aesthetic Education, Volume 4, Number 2, April 1970, p. 54.

[24] Ibid., p. 55.

[25] Ibid., p. 55.

[26] Ibid., p. 55.

[27] Stanley S. Madeja, "The CEMREL Aesthetic Education Progaom: A Report," The Journal of Aesthetic Education, Volume 10, Numbers 3-4, July-October 1976, p. 210.

[28] Madeja and Kelley, op. cit., p. 55.

[29] The specific people and subject areas involved here include: Music: Bennett Reimer, Case Western Reserve University; Dance: Alma Hawkins, University of California, Los Angeles; Theatre: Brian Hansen, University of Deleware; Visual Arts: Reid Hastie, Texas Tech University; Literature: Alan Purves, University of Illinois; Aesthetics: David Ecker, New York University.

[30] Madeja and Kelley, op. cit., p. 60.

[31] The Five Sense Store: The Aesthetic Education Program, CEMREL, Inc., p. 3.

[32] See Madeja, "The CEMREL Aesthetic Education Program: A Report," op. cit., pp. 209-216.

[33] This way of characterizing the approach taken by the CEMREL consultants and staff was suggested to me by Madeja in a telephone conversation of December 3, 1979.

[34] In the telephone conversation cited in note 33 above, Madeja indicated the following people had been especially influential in helping develop the theoretical foundations in aesthetics for the CEMREL program: Harry S. Broudy, David Ecker, and Eugene F. Kaelin; and Arthur Foshay, Nathaniel Champlin, and Morris Weitz. In reading through the literature on this aspect of the program, it became clear that the first three people, as well as Madeja himself, represent points of view which became incorporated into the Aesthetic Education Program.

[35] Stanley S. Madeja and Sheila Onuska, Through the Arts to the Aesthetic (St. Louis, Missouri: CEMREL, Inc, 1977), p. 3.

[36] Evan J. Kern, "The Aesthetic Education Program: Past, Present and Future," Theory into Practice, Volume X, Number 3, June 1971, p. 185.

[37] Madeja and Onuska, op. cit., pp. 3-4.

[38] Barkan, et. al., op. cit., p. 7.

[39] Harry S. Broudy, "The Whys and Hows of Aesthetic Education," (St. Louis, Missouri: CEMREL, Inc., 1977), pp. 1-2.

[40] See Harry S. Broudy, "The Structure of Knowledge in the Arts," in Ralph A. Smith, editor, Aesthetics and Criticism in Art Education (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966).

[41] Eugene F. Kaelin, "Aesthetic Education: A Role for Aesthetics Proper," in Ralph A. Smith, editor, Aesthetics and Problems of Education (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971).

[42] Harry S. Broudy, "Preparing Teachers of Aesthetic Education," Teacher Education for Aesthetic Education: A Progress Report (St. Louis, Missouri: CEMREL, Inc., 1972), p. 10.

[43] Broudy, "The Whys and Hows of Aesthetic Education," op. cit., p. 71.

[44] Harry S. Broudy, Enlightened Cherishing: An Essay on Aesthetic Education (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972), p. 48.

[45] For specific information on the availability of curriculum units, interested persons can contact: Comenius, Inc., Weston, Connecticut, 06883.

[46] Teacher's Guide, "Relating Sound and Movement," p. 6.

[47] ibid., p. 6.

[48] Ibid., p. 6.

[49] Ibid., p. 6.

[50] Ibid., p. 14.

[51] Ibid., p. 15.

[52] Ibid., p. 18.

[53] Ibid., p. 18.

[54] Ibid., p. 20.

[55] Ibid., p. 21.

[56] Ibid., p. 30.

[57] Ibid., p. 32.

[58] Ibid., p. 32.

[59] Ibid., p. 38.

[60] See Michael W. Apple, "Curricular Form and the Logic of Technical Control: Building the Possessive Individual," unpublished paper, University of Wisconsin- Madison, fall, 1979.

[61] See, for example, Individualism, Steven Lukes (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1973); and Lucien Goldman, The Philosophy of the Enlightenment (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973).

[62] Michael W. Apple and Nancy R. King, "What Do Schools Teach?" Curriculum Inquiry, Volume 6, Number 4, Fall, 1977.

[63] See also Maxine Greene, "The Matter of Mtstification: Teacher Education in Unquiet Times," in Landscapes of Learning (New York: Teachers College Press, 1979).

[64] Broudy, Enlightened Cherishing, op. cit., p. 57.

[65] See Landon E. Beyer, "Aesthetic Theory and the Ideology of Educational Institutions," Curriculum Inquiry, Volume 9, Number 1, Spring, 1979.

[66] See Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Reflective Teaching and Field-Based Experience in Teacher Education," a paper presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association,April, 1979.

[67] Working in the field-based teacher preparation propgram in elementary education at the University of Wisconsin- Madison, I have actively sought to link aesthetic meanings with emancipatory curriculum, at a number of levels. One example may be illustrative here.

During the fall semester of the 1979-80 school year, a student teacher of mine became interested in exploring the question of what gets taught within units in social studies and government, and what does not (see Raymond Williams, "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory," Schooling and Capitalism, Roger Dale, et. al. editors, op. cit.). This student developed a unit for fourth and fifth grade students which honestly and openly investigated forms of government and economic systems, including capitalism, socialism, communism, fascism, and anarchism. The culminating activity for this unit was a play, written by students, based on their understandings from discussions and readings about these economic and political forms. The students responded enthusiastically to this and, in all, it was a very successful venture into the political/ aesthetic realm. This and similar activities are certainly one source of the guarded optimism this writer holds.

[68] Beyer, "Schools, Aesthetic Forms, and Social Reproduction," op. cit.

[69] I am grateful to Ann Sherman for suggesting this way of putting the approach outlined in this section.